



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	103251.58983US	5757

23911 7590 10/13/2009  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
P.O. BOX 14300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER
----------

PULLIAM, CHRISTYANN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/13/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/865,773	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUDA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Christyann RF Pulliam	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2009 and 07 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 149-153 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 149-153 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/7/2009</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 149-153 are pending as filed July 10, 2009. All claims are new. Claims 1-148 are canceled.
2. Examiner thanks the Applicant's Representative for limiting the variations on the invention described in the claims.
3. The Information Disclosure filed October 7, 2009 has been considered. However, the three articles listed as C5, C6 and C7 were not provided to Examiner and were therefore not considered.
4. Based on the new claims filed, new grounds of rejection are provided. Therefore, this action is FINAL.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 149-153 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies et al., WO 99/12108 (provided by Applicant with IDS filed Dec. 8, 2003) (hereinafter Davies), and in view of Burner et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,282,548 (hereinafter Burner).

As for Claim 149, Davies teaches:

A method of saving web page data comprising:

providing a save option within a window of a browser client (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #502);

receiving a selection of the save option from a user (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #502);

acquiring web page data browsed by the browser client when the selection of the save option is received from the user (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #503-504);

extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #507-511);

assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index comprising the extracted keyword to the acquired web page data (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #512, page 5, lines 11-14, page 7, lines 1-15, index and keywords – pages 8-9); and

saving, subsequent to the keyword extraction, the acquired web page data browsed by the browser client in correspondence with the assigned indices in a predefined database, the saved web page data being sufficient to regenerate at least a

Art Unit: 2165

portion of a previously browsed web page without accessing to the original source (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #509-512, Figures 2-3, page 5, lines 11-14, intelligent page store IPS stores metadata and source con text sufficient to recreate the page, applicant independent marked-up versions and index and keywords – pages 8-9),

Davies does not make clear whether the user enters a file name or not (See e.g. Davies – pages 8-9 allows user annotation and added keywords, does not appear to require the user to name the IPS file, Figure 3 shows the IPS Files). However, Burner teaches wherein the acquired web page data is saved without prompting the user for a file name or destination folder when the selection of the save option is received from the user (See e.g. Burner – Figure 11, client machines already knows information about page to save, user does not need to enter it and Figure 12c, col. 13, line 65- col. 14, line 15). Burner also teaches archived versions of pages (See e.g. Burner - Figure 13, col. 14) as well as metadata storage, annotations, recommendations (See e.g. Burner – col. 2, lines 20-64, Figure 4, col.7, line 13- col. 9, line 60).

Davies and Burner are from the analogous art of saving browsed data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Davies and Burner to have combined Davies and Burner. The motivation to combine Davies and Burner is detail saving browsed data. Due to the overlapping subject matter, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Davies and Burner.

Art Unit: 2165

As for Claim 150, Davies as modified by Burner teaches parent Claim 149.

Davies also teaches:

providing a second save option within the window of the browser client (See e.g.

Davies – Figure 5 #502);

receiving a selection of the second save option from the user (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #502); and

acquiring web page data browsed by the browser client when the browser client newly browses the web page data, when the selection of the second save option has been received from the user (See e.g. Davies – Figure 5 #501-504, pages 8-9),

*Note: the second save option does not appear to be functionally different from the first option. It appears to only require a second use of the save option as it is described in this claim. Both references trigger methods when go to new page.*

Davies does not make clear whether the user enters a file name or not (See e.g. Davies – pages 8-9 allows user annotation and added keywords, does not appear to require the user to name the IPS file, Figure 3 shows the IPS Files). However, Burner teaches wherein the acquired web page data is saved without any further instruction from the user when the browser client is subsequently operated to move to another URL, when the selection of the second save option has been received from the user. (See e.g. Burner – Figure 11, client machines already knows information about page to save, user does not need to enter it and Figure 12c, col. 13, line 55- col. 14, line 15).

Art Unit: 2165

As for Claim 151, Davies as modified by Burner teaches parent Claims 149-150. Burner also teaches wherein the second save option includes a user selectable option to save only links of the browsed data or page contents of the browsed data (See e.g. Burner – Figures 11-12d). Davies teaches saving links and content (See e.g. Davies – page 10, lines 1-5 and page 9, lines 1-10).

As for Claim 152, Davies as modified by Burner teaches parent Claims 149-150. Burner teaches wherein the second save option further includes an exclusion option that excludes saving particular web pages (See e.g. Burner – col. 14, lines 23-35, col. 15, lines 40-65 user control over storage of classes of pages).

As for Claim 153, Davies as modified by Burner teaches parent Claim 149. Davies also teaches further comprising: displaying the first or second index within the browser client, wherein when the first index is displayed, a representation of the acquired web page data is listed in an order sorted by date, and wherein when the second index is displayed the representation of the acquired web page data is listed in an order sorted by keyword (See e.g. Davies – page 8 -page 9, line 10 – date, keywords both stored so list can be sorted on either, page 9, line 26- page 10, line 23 – ranked lists by date stored and relevance/keywords).

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments based on the amendments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2165

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christyann RF Pulliam whose telephone number is (571)270-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 am-6 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Neveen Abel-Jalil can be reached on 571-272-4074. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. R. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

October 8, 2009

/Neeven Abel-Jalil/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165